# T- No Restriction Spec

## 1NC

### 1NC- No FS Spec- Generic

#### Interpretation- On the Jan/Feb 2017 topic, the aff cannot specify a single type of constitutionally protected speech that their advocacy does remove a restriction for. To clarify, plan inclusive counterplans that remove restrictions in single type of speech are illegitimate.

#### “Any” is a negative polarity term which means that it is indefinite- especially considering that the res\* is a downward entailing operator

**Kadmon and Landman 93** [Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman. “Any” Linguistics and Philosophy Vol 16, No. 4 Aug 1993. Springer. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25001516. ] NB

As is well known, any can function in two different ways hand, it can be a negative polarity item - POLARITY SENSITIV on the other hand, it has what is called a 'free choice' inte FREE CHOICE (FC) any. In this paper, we will propose a unifie of the semantic and pragmatic effects of any, which applies to its uses. The use of any as a negative polarity it is illustrated in (1) and (2). (1) I don't have any potatoes. (2) \*I have any potatoes. According to Ladusaw 1979's well known analysis, negative polarity items (NPIs) are only licensed if they are in the scope of a downward entailing operator. A downward entailing (DE) operator is an operator that reverses the direction of entailment, roughly as specified in (3) (using > for entailment). (3) O is a DE operator iff if A => B then O(B) = O(A). On Ladusaw's account, example (1) is OK because any is in the scope of negation, which, as illustrated in (4), is a DE operator. (4) swim = move I don't move => I don't swim In example (2), any is not licensed, because there is no DE operator that any is in the scope of. Ladusaw's analysis elegantly accounts for a wide range of examples. Besides negative vs. affirmative pairs like (1) and (2), it deals, for example, with examples (5)-(8). (5) At most three girls saw anything. (6) \*At least three girls saw anything. (7) Every girl who saw anything was happy. (8) \*Some girl who saw anything was happy. Assuming, with Generalized Quantifier Theory, that determiners are two place relations between a nominal property and a verbal property, Ladu saw predicts that (5) and (7) are OK because the determiner at most three is DE on its second argument (as well as the first) and the determiner every is DE on its first argument. (6) and (8) are out because at least three and some are not DE on either argument. Ladusaw's analysis of polarity sensitivity is quite successful. It gives semantic content to Klima 1964's suggestion that NPIs are licensed by 'affective' expressions, and it improves upon the analysis of Baker (1970), which is based on licensing by overt negation, in that the notion of DE provides a uniform account of the licensing of NPIs in examples with and without negation. However, there remain some empirical and theoretical issues that Ladusaw's analysis leaves unresolved. We now turn to such issues. We note the four issues summarized in (9), on which we will comment in turn immediately below. (9) constitutes, in fact, a summary of our goals: what we set out to do in this paper is provide an analysis of any that can successfully deal with these four issues. (9)i. the connection between PS any and FC any (goal: a unified analysis); ii. any as an expression which indicates reduced tolerance of ex ceptions; iii. the distribution of the NPI as determined by its meaning and function; iv. empirical problems with the licensing of NPIs I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PS ANY AND FC ANY. (10)-(12) are ex amples of free choice any. (10) Any owl hunts mice. (11) Any lawyer could tell you that. (12) I would dance with anybody. Ladusaw (1979) offers a whole battery of arguments that show beyond doubt that PS any is an indefinite with an existential meaning. (Arguments for this are also given by Horn (1972) and others.) FC any, on the other hand, seems to have universal quantificational force. And this goes beyond mere appearance. Carlson (1981) gives several arguments that FC any is in fact a universal quantifier. A strong argument is the behavior of almost. Almost is an operator that can modify only universal determiners, as illustrated in (13)-(15). (13) Almost every lawyer could answer that question (14)Almostnolawyer (15)\*Almostsomelaw As (16) and (17) show, alm strongly suggests that FC (16)Almostanylawye (17)\*Idon'thavealmo (This goes back to Horn absolutely. Note that we alm ost is a sentential ad conclusion - towards w ambiguous:PSanyisan quantifier.

#### “Any” does not tolerate exceptions, because it’s either an existential quantifier or a universal quantifier

**Kadmon and Landman 93** [Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman. “Any” Linguistics and Philosophy Vol 16, No. 4 Aug 1993. Springer. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25001516. ] NB

What is it that any adds to the meaning of the indefinite NP? We think it contributes what we have described above as reduced tolerance of exceptions. Compare the (a) and (b) sentences in the following examples. (26)a. I don’t have potatoes. b. I don’t have any potatoes. (=(l) above) (27)a. Every man who has matches is happy. b. Every man who has any matches is happy. (28)a. An owl hunts mice. (=(22) above) b. Any owl hunts mice. (=(10) above) In some sense, the (b) sentences rule out exceptions more strongly than the (a) sentences do. Let us clarify and illustrate this point. A context of utterance sets up a domain of quantification, from which all sorts of things are excluded. For example, in a given context, rotten potatoes or sick owls may be excluded as irrelevant. For that reason, you can accept (26a) as true even if you know that I do in fact have a few rotten potatoes in the back yard, and you can accept (283) as true even if you don’t think that sick owls hunt mice. The effect of any in the (b) sentences, especially when it carries main or emphatic stress, is to indicate that even things that could previously be disregarded as irrelevant (in a given context) are no exception to the claim being made. Thus, I don’t have ANY potatoes may imply: not even rotten ones; ANY owl hunts mice may imply: even a sick one - the use of any indicates that even rotten potatoes or sick owls (which might have otherwise been disregarded) are no exception. In what follows, we will discuss several concrete cases, where we supply contexts for our example sentences. The content of utterance may implicitly or explicitly suggest that only cooking potatoes (the regular potatoes you might find in the pantry) are relevant. For example, suppose you say (29) or (30). (29) Could we make some French fries? (30) I feel like French fries. Do you have cooking potatoes today? If I utter (26a) (1 don’t have potatoes) in the context of what you have just said, I mean that I don’t have cooking potatoes. In this context, it is irrelevant that I do have, say, some potted potatoes decorating my room (on the assumption that my potted potatoes are not cooking potatoes), since non-cooking potatoes are not taken into account. Because my potted potatoes are disregarded in the context, they constitute legitimate excep- tions to the claim I made by uttering (26a). Now, suppose you say (30) and I reply by saying (26b): 1 don’t have ANY potatoes! This time, I am not just talking about the potatoes that would normally be considered relevant in the context of (30) (i.e. regular cooking potatoes); this time I am saying that I don’t have other potatoes, either. My utterance may very well imply that I am no longer in possession of the potted potatoes that you eyed hungrily on previous occasions. Even though decorative potatoes would not normally be relevant in the context of (30), the use of any may indicate that they too are no exception to the claim that I don’t have potatoes.

#### That outweighs– tons of court rulings support my interpretation

**Elder 91:** Elder (David S. Elder, October 1991, "Any and All": To Use Or Not To Use?” "Plain Language' is a regular feature of the Michigan Bar Journal, edited by Joseph Kimble for the State Bar Plain English Committee. Assistant editor is George H. Hathaway. RW

The Michigan Supreme Court seemed to approve our dictionary definitions of "any" in Harrington v Interstate Business Men's Accident Ass'n, 210 Mich 327, 330; 178 NW 19 (1920), when it quoted Hopkins v Sanders, 172 Mich 227; 137 NW 709 (1912). The Court defined "any" like this: "In broad language, it covers 'any final decree' in 'any suit at law or in chan- cery' in 'any circuit court.' Any' means ,every,' 'each one of all."' In a later case, the Michigan Supreme Court again held that the use of "any" in an agency contract meant "all." In Gibson v AgriculturalLife Ins Co, 282 Mich 282, 284; 276 NW 450 (1937), the clause in controversy read: "14. The Company shall have, and is hereby given a first lien upon any com- missions or renewals as security for any claim due or to become due to the Companyfrom saidAgent." (Em- phasis added.) The Gibson court was not persuaded by the plaintiff's insistence that the word "any" meant less than "all": "Givingthe wordingof paragraph14 oJ the agency contract its plain and un- equivocable meaning, upon arrivingat the conclusion that the sensible conno- tation of the word any' implies 'all' and not 'some,' the legal conclusionfollows that the defendant is entitled to retain the earned renewal commissions aris- ing from its agency contract with Gib- son and cannot be held legally liablefor same in this action," Gibson at 287 (quoting the trial court opinion). The Michigan Court of Appeals has similarly interpreted the word "any" as used in a Michigan statute. In McGrath v Clark, 89 Mich App 194; 280 NW2d 480 (1979), the plaintiff accepted de- fendant's offer of judgment. The offer said nothing about prejudgment inter- est. The statute the Court examined was MCL 600.6013; MSA 27A.6013: "Interest shall be allowed on any money judgment recovered in a civil action...." The Court held that "the word 'any' is to be considered all-inclusive," so the defendants were entitled to interest. McGrathat 197. Recently, the Court has again held that "[alny means 'every,' 'each one of all,' and is unlimited in its scope." Parkerv Nationwide Mutual Ins Co, 188 Mich App 354, 356; 470 NW2d 416 (1991) (quoting Harrington v Inter- State Men's Accident Ass'n, supra)

#### Violation-

#### 1. Specification is incompatible with “any” as an indefinite. Indefinites do not refer to particular instantiations of the resolution.

**NOD** [New Oxford Dictionary “Indefinite” adjective.] NB

lasting for an unknown or unstated length of time: they may face indefinite detention. • not clearly expressed or defined; vague: their status remains indefinite. • Grammar (of a word, inflection, or phrase) not determining the person, thing, time, etc., referred to.

#### 2. Even if “any” permits few exceptions, the aff is only a single example of the resolution, so it can’t affirm the general rule of the resolution, let alone exclude any exception. They justify whole res affs that perm every cp as part of an exception

#### Standards

#### 1. Semantics- our interpretation is best aligned with the definitions of individual words and the usage of “any” in different instances. Our interp is the most grammatical and is the most objective since it doesn’t rely on arbitrary determinants of what constitutes the best type of debate- and it determines the stasis point for what we know before the round.

#### 2. Limits- They allow way too many affs if they can allow infinite specifications of types of speech in certain scenarios. Even if there are some turns, the aff is massively overprepped for them since it limits their prep burden whereas im expected to prep against each of these affs. Generics don’t solve- agent CPs or state bad Ks aren’t persuasive vs a nuanced Aff that which has nuanced link turns specific to their aff against these. Their counterinterp proves that there’s a t version of the aff- reading it as an advantage solves their education offense and allows for a broader comparison. They explode neg prep burden and predictability which kills fairness and engagement because there isn’t sufficient literature against their position. Caselist: [zones, journalism, offensive words, political speech, advertisements, war protests, painting, not saluting, burning flag, newspapers, specific campuses, dress codes, pornography, books, religious expression, cyberspeech, organizations inside the campus, specific people, specific times, specific places, specific manners on the campuses, commercial speech, speech against specific activities, rights of individual employees on campuses, etc.]

Voter

#### 1. Fairness, debates a competitive activity, 2. Education, only portable impact. Drop the debater because A. Norms- a loss deters future abuse, B. Timeskew- drop the arg means they can kick their offense for a positive time tradeoff. C. Gateway issue- unfair args skew the rest of the round. Evaluate Competing Interps, A. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention, B. deterrence- debaters can get away with defense on theory, C. reasonability collapses into competing itnersp because we have offense defense debates about brightlines, D. it’s a binary- either the aff is topical or it’s not 5. No RVI: A. Chills theory- RVIs deter me from reading theory because good theory debaters will bait abuse and go for the RVI which causes infinite abuse. B. Kills substance- they will just collapse to the shell which ruins the possibility of us ever returning to having education. C. Illogical- you shouldn’t win for being fair. Logic is an impact because it’s the basis of argumentation. D. No abuse- you could read your own shell or prove that I violate and you don’t which equals the theory layer

## 2NC- Semantics

### 2NC- Model of Debate

#### Topicality is a question f what you want debates on the topic to look like. Our model of debate allows affirmatives to still read specific types of speech, but the neg can read DAs to other types of speech too that don’t interact with the specifity of the advantage that they have rad. This type of debate forces more impact comparison and is a better question of whether the resolution is good. Policymakers who debate about free speech rights argue about how policies would compare with different examples being compared. This type of debate forces more impact comparison but it also allows our offense to at least have a chance at mattering. We would be able to compare size of links, probability, magnitude, and timeframe of even more scenarios which maximizes the amount of topic education that we can get from debate. Our model also forces research skills because the best debaters will be the ones who have prep on each of these specific scenarios but it will also at least allow debates to occur which increases clash. Their interpretation underlimits and cuts off access to even creating the possibility of debate in the first place- we lose all impact comparison and risk analysis skills which ruins the point of debate as an activity that encourages clash.

### 2NC- Kick Semantics

#### 1. They haven’t justified an offensive reason to vote for them- they’v only proven that they are a semantic interpretation of the topic. That’s just a reason for why their practice is included- not why their practice is independently good or why our practice is exclusively bad. Semantics is a NIB to theory- but in the worst case- both of our interepreations are semantically correct- they can’t go for this as a turn in the 2AR

#### 2. The resolution is focused on the word “any” and how it doesn’t allow exceptions or specific instantiations- it’s still fine to defend all forms of speech. That would be absurd for them to claim that just because the resolution didn’t say “all forms of free speech” that our interp is not grammatical.

#### 3. Small link to predictability- the terminal impact of semantics is based on the notion of preround preparation- we are still able to gage general topic areas which proves that issues like limits are much stronger internal links

### 2NR- Semantics Weighing

#### 1. semantics have intuitive priority. Adhere to intuition because it’s unfair for debate to be count-intuitive- Semantic justifications have logical priority. For example the semantic approach would say the statement “bachelors are married” is false. But a pragmatic approach could say “I’ll give you a million dollars if bachelors are married.” Even though you may want the million dollars, all the pragmatic approach offers you are a reasons to want the interpretation to be true, not an actual reason for it to be true.

#### 2. Semantics preserve substantive engagement and deter abusive strategies. Deprioritizing semantics permits never-ending debates on the marginal benefits of an interpretation –

#### 3. Semantics control the internal link into topic literature because they frame how authors understand topical discussion. Thus a pre-requisite for any ground is the correct semantical interpretation.

#### 4. Semantics prevent frivolous theory debate because we can always argue about marginal benefits of one interpretation, but there is only one true way to interpret the meaning of the resolution.

#### 5. Semantics control the internal link into predictability. We prepare to debate the topic rather than for each pragmatic interpretation preferred on an arbitrary basis. Thus even if there is better ground under your interp, that doesn’t matter because no one will be prepared to debate it.

#### 6. Topicality is a question of jurisdiction – what arguments count as offensive under the resolution. Semantics outweigh because they are the only type of argument that address the true scope of the topic, pragmatics only speak to how we arbitrarily limit it further.

#### 7. Pragmatic debates are ultimately irresolvable and unverifiable, there’s no metric to determine how much lit/ground is lost under any interp. Prefer semantics because we can use definitions, metrics like how many times an article has been cited, and credentials to move towards an objectively true understanding of the topic.

## 2NC- Limits

### AT Lit/Generics Check

#### 1. Link Turn- They pigeonhole the 1NC into specific strategies which kills our variability because we are forced towards generics and weak preparation every single time- that limits strategy and our ability to engage with the aff.

#### 2. Link Turn- the the 1AR is overprepped on each of these arguments which makes it incredibly hard for the 2NR which has to multipoint every single argument whereas the 2AR can simply sit on one specific argument especially considering that the 1AR has been laid out with perfect efficiency

#### 3. Link Turn- They screw over the depth of discussion that we can have over the topic- The only world in which we have topic education are debates where the negs have written specific case negs, otherwise- it leads to repetitive debates where we only get to analyze the topic for some debates. Otherwise we'll be reading the same state bad Ks, theory shells, and args in the other world. This independently impacts to topic education and turns their offense

### AT Stable Adv.

#### 1. Link Defense- 2NR Theory Checks back. We will force you to defend specific links to whole res affs in CX- if you don't abide- we'll read theory because that's abusive. There's no reason we can't have data or links that are more holisitc than others- or why your interp uniquely grants access to a stable advocacy

#### 2. Link Defense- Reading your plan as an advantage solves- that allows us to get both specific links that answer back any potential shift arguments.

#### 3. Nonunique- You can still have an advocacy text- a shift is ridiculous- you cant just be like pscyh- and shfit out of neg DAs in the 1AR.

### AT Disclosure

#### 1. Link Turn- It's not a quesiton of whether or not your practice is justified within the round- default to a norms setting model- their interpretation justifies people reading a ton of different affs just because in their scenario it's justified. That ruins norms for the future and outweighs because it affects all future rounds too

#### 2. Link Defense- There are too many possible affs for us to be able to prep because even if you have disclosed it- your prep will always be better than ours because that's the only aff that you have to prep before the tournament, but we have to be responsible to a ton of case negs and can't handle the specifity of your aff

#### 3. Link Defense- People break new in high stake rounds all the time which ruins the point of disclosure- it doesn't solve abuse in every instance and ruins clash at the highest layer

#### 4. Link Defense- Just because the aff is disclosed doesn't make it fair- you can easily jsut cherrypick an aff that probabily affirms on the topic, but we'll always be playing catchup int erms of the prep that we'll have to do.

### AT Hyperspec DAs/PICs

#### 1. Turn – our argument isn’t hyperspecific debate bad- its that hyperspecifics should go both sides so the neg can read their specific DAs and aff their plans as advantages – creates in depth discussion across a bredth of topics that best models policymaking while eliminating prep skews

#### 2. Alternate Solvency and Link Turn- if the neg reads abusive args, then the 1AR can read arguments like PICs Bad, this is net better rather than prohibiting PICs in general because it forces us to consider the legitimacy of the 1NC strategy each round it's read in. That creates a specifity advantage on the theory debate which allows us to determine better norms of whatever PICs or DAs we actually do read

#### 3. Infinite Regress- All interpretations allow for some abusive strategies- but this argument is similar to saying that the aff gets to read 3 aprioris because the neg can read 4 nibs, it's about whether or not your interpretation is proactively fair as a norm- the world of our interpretation also prohibits these practices- but yours doesn't.

#### 4. Link Turn- Negs get screwed over more by hyperspecific affs compared to the abuse from hyperspecific negs because our interpretations bolsters more analytical argumetns and impact comparison rather than relying on preround preparation consistently- but it doesn't ban preround preparation either because the best debaters would have prepped those scnearios.

#### 5. Even if they win that specific 1NCS ARE BAD--- Specific 1NCs seem better for their education arguments because it increases the breadth of arguments that both sides have to deal with- if you expect us to prep all possible affs that you can read, we should expect you to prep and be prepared to defend eachp art of your aff.

### AT MultiActor Fiat

#### 1. Link Defense- There are plenty of solvency advocates that are prepared to defend that all actors in the resolution should pass a specific policy

#### 2. Link Defense- Multiactor fiat isn’t bad as long as they derive their advantages from the topic rather than cooperation- but it also proves that the offense that they cite as becoming otentiallya busive- wont become an issue in the future

3. Particularism – they need to outline specific reasons all colleges acting in unison would create unpredictable ground – else it’s the same as reading a bunch of plans,

4. No impact to utopianism specifically on this topic – multiactor fiat is possible when its an issue of adhering university policy to the constitution which is a federal requirement and utopian discussion still educates about what policies to advocate for in the real world

### 2NR- Limits/Fair Weighing

#### 1. Fairness controls the internal link to education- if substance has already been skewed,t hat makes it impossible for us to determine whether or not it's educational to begin with if it's heavly skewed—this proves that any of our offense to limits turns their education arguments

#### 2. Try or die for fairness- we can always get education about their policy options by reading the news or reading a book- but fairness is constitituve of debate and is more imminent in this round

#### 3. Strength of Link- if we have a ton of defense to their education claims- then you should vote off fairnesss offense because it's more likely to be true

#### 4. Aff abuse on limits outweighs- it affects every single speech for the debate,b ut the abuse from the neg affects less speeches, aff abuse is worse because more speeches have been tainted.

#### 5. Burden of rejoinder- if the aff is abusive, the negative cannot engage in it at all, which forces a race to the bottom because the debte just becomes a quesiton of whoever can end up being more abusive

6. Fairness is constitutitve – debate is competitive, and it motivates education and research – empirics prove debaters innovate to win

## 2NC- Answers

### AT (Some Plank Limits Possible Affs)

#### 1. that's just defense-- but that wouldn’t really answer much of the defense on educaiton based arguments.

#### 2. if there are debate wide endorsement of this model of debate, if you have a 7 min case neg, this introduces variability for the 1ar. there are heavy incentives to engage the aff's advantages- the best debaters will be the ones that have the most of the prep on these args.

### AT Overing 14 (neg ground limited all the time)

#### There is a major distinction that they are missing out on- our interp allows a lot more comparitive neg gruond because we can still argue within the bounds of the topic rather than being limited by the type of arguments that we can read in specific instances when they read a plan.

### AT Overing 14 (Plans k2 empirics debates, not generalizable)

#### 1. Turn- my model of debate solves- we just do impact comparison between specific countries, our interp requires intra- and inter-country comparison- which leads to better weighing and risks analysis across more debates. That also forces international weighing and international modes of thought which expands our knowledge about the empirical world

#### 2. No Link- we can still weigh between impacts in our world and control for various empirical issues- that puts them in a double bind. Either A. There is a resolvability issue in my world, which means that there is also a resolvability issue in your world because we do empirics weighing or B. There is no resolvability issue which means there's nof offense to your argument. Their version or knowledge of whole res debates are too generalized.

#### 3. No impact to education in this scenario- the education that we get from the empirics debate anyways is horrible because A. We aren't experts in the topic or statiscians who know how to use methodologies or compare scope of studies, B. Most debaters don't have methodologies anyways so they choose not to engage on any of those issues

#### 4. Impact Defense- Issues wit resolvability are empirically denied because judges will be able to find a nuanced way to compare evidence such as strenth of link and sizes of various impacts.

### AT Research Skills

#### 1. Link Defense- Our interp meets- we permit debaters to still read country specific clash and weighing- we also allow debaters to read other counries. But the best debaters will be the ones who end up cutting those specific case negs to their affs.

#### 2. Link Turn- Research overload is probably bad especially in the instance of the aff because it forces students to sacrifice a lot of other values and they lose out on developing ohter skills before tournaments such as drilling and researching other parts of the debate

#### 3. Link Turn- our model of debate also forces critical thinking because it makes students defend specific scenarios and think on their feet for the util debate with unique impact comparison and new education. That critical thinking outweighs because A.It forces debates and equalizes it for everyone so that debate is based on skill- rather than how many coaches you have., B. Forces more cognitive imagination and creativity which ensures students are prepared for future scenarios that they can't necessarily predict.

#### 4. Link Turn- There's a frequency advantage because more people will at least attempt to engage the aff- otherwise the only type of schols that will engage your aff are Greenhill, Harvard Westlake, Harker, and Lynbrook- you can and should still be able to talk about the topic even if you haven't done a godly amount of research

#### 5. Topic Debate o/w Overburdening the aff with research- we will only get two mnotsh to discuss the topic- but the aff should research all the time on these topics anyways

#### 6. No impact- we can always learn how to research from other places such as college

### AT Depth of Education

#### 1. no impact to depth – none of us are going to be involved in \_\_\_ in the rest of our lives. Also depth is impossible in 26 minutes of LD speeches anyway, which means broader knowledge comes first.

#### 2.Turn- Breadth of education o/w depth since we accumulate knowledge about the broader underlying issues across many places